

Applic. No. 10/623,068
Amdt. dated June 7, 2007
Reply to Office action of March 21, 2007

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUN 08 2007

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-29 and 32-34 remain in the application. Claims 1 and 22 have been amended. Claims 1-21 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 30 and 31 were previously cancelled.

In the third paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action claims 22-24 and 29 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Funada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,229) (hereinafter "Funada"), which was incorrectly designated as 6,078,299 by the Examiner, under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The rejection has been noted and the claims have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. The claims are patentable for the reasons set forth below. Support for the changes is found in Fig. 14 and on page 19, lines 11-16, page 21, lines 3-5 of the specification.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Applic. No. 10/623,068
Amdt. dated June 7, 2007
Reply to Office action of March 21, 2007

Claim 22 calls for, *inter alia*:

at least one interconnection configured for coupling the filter device to a wiring substrate using flip-chip technology, the interconnection being a solder or metal bump.

Funada explicitly discloses that the bump (16) connects the piezoelectric substrate (11) (Examiner's "carrier substrate") to the circuit substrate (12) (Examiner's "capping substrate") (Fig. 6D). Funada does not disclose a wiring substrate. Accordingly, Funada does not disclose an interconnection for coupling a filter device (carrier substrate, the capping substrate, and the filter) to an additional wiring substrate, where the interconnection is a solder or metal bump.

The reference does not show at least one interconnection configured for coupling the filter device to a wiring substrate using flip-chip technology, the interconnection being a solder or metal bump, as recited in claim 1 of the instant application. The Funada reference discloses a piezoelectric substrate and a circuit substrate connected by a bump. Funada does not disclose that a carrier substrate, filter, and a capping substrate are connected to a wiring substrate by an interconnection being a solder or metal bump. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application

Applic. No. 10/623,068
Amdt. dated June 7, 2007
Reply to Office action of March 21, 2007

as claimed, in which at least one interconnection is configured for coupling the filter device to a wiring substrate using flip-chip technology, the interconnection being a solder or metal bump.

In the penultimate paragraph on page 3 of the Office action, claims 25 and 26 have been rejected as being obvious over Funada (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,229) in view of Tanski (U.S. Patent No. 4,409,570) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Tanski does not make up for the deficiencies of Funada. Since claim 22 is believed to be allowable, dependent claims 25 and 26 are believed to be allowable as well.

In the last paragraph on page 3 of the Office action, claims 27 and 28 have been rejected as being obvious over Funada (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,229) in view of Penunuri (U.S. Patent No. 5,287,036) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Penunuri does not make up for the deficiencies of Funada. Since claim 22 is believed to be allowable, dependent claims 27 and 28 are believed to be allowable as well.

In the first paragraph on page 4 of the Office action, claims 32-34 have been rejected as being obvious over Funada (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,229) in view of Yamada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,932,950) (hereinafter "Yamada") under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applic. No. 10/623,068
Amdt. dated June 7, 2007
Reply to Office action of March 21, 2007

Yamada does not make up for the deficiencies of Funada. Since claim 22 is believed to be allowable, dependent claims 32-34 are believed to be allowable as well.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 22. Claim 22 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 22, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-29 and 32-34 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Applic. No. 10/623,068
Amdt. dated June 7, 2007
Reply to Office action of March 21, 2007

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect
to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner
Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicant(s)

Alfred K. Dassler
52,794

AKD:cgm

June 7, 2007

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101